

KANEKO, et al., 10/821,847
04 June 2008 Amendment
Responsive to 04 February 2008 Office Action

503.39918VX1 / P5676-1/SK
Page 11

REMARKS

This paper is responsive to any paper(s) indicated above, and is responsive in any other manner indicated below.

PENDING CLAIMS

Claims 1-17 were pending, under consideration and subjected to examination in the Office Action. Appropriate claims have been amended, canceled and/or added (without prejudice or disclaimer) in order to adjust a clarity and/or focus of Applicant's claimed invention. That is, such changes are unrelated to any prior art or scope adjustment and are simply refocused claims in which Applicant is present interested. At entry of this paper, Claims 3-27 will be pending for further consideration and examination in the application.

ALL REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC '102 AND '103 - TRAVERSED

All 35 USC rejections (i.e., the 35 USC '102 rejection of claims 1-7 as being anticipated by Harada et al. (U.S. Patent 4,866,348); the rejection of claims 1-17 as being anticipated by Sekiya et al. (U.S. Patent 6,583,775); and, the 35 USC '103 rejection of claims 8-17 as being unpatentable over Harada et al. (U.S. Patent 4,866,348) in view of Sekiya et al. (U.S. Patent 6,583,775)) are respectfully traversed.

All descriptions of Applicant's disclosed and claimed invention, and all descriptions and rebuttal arguments regarding the applied prior art, as previously submitted by Applicant in any form, are repeated and incorporated hereat by reference. Further, all Office Action statements regarding the prior art rejections are

KANEKO, et al., 10/821,847
04 June 2008 Amendment
Responsive to 04 February 2008 Office Action

503.39918VX1 / P5676-1/SK
Page 12

respectfully traversed. As additional arguments, Applicant respectfully submits the following.

It is respectfully noted that Applicant's claims were previously amended to change the initial "electro optical elements" feature recited in Applicant's claims, to an —organic light emitting diodes—feature, to which the Examiner previously indicated would render Applicant's claims allowable. The Examiner is respectfully requested to comment regarding the propriety of the allowability of such claims.

In beginning traversal of the rejections, in order to properly support a '102 anticipatory-type rejection, any applied art reference must disclose each and every limitation of any rejected claim. The applied art does not adequately support a '102 anticipatory-type rejection because, at minimum, such applied art does not disclose (or suggest) the following discussed limitations of Applicant's claims, as set forth in arguments provided by Applicant's foreign patent representative.

Claims 3-7 v. Harada et al.

Features of the present invention are to establish in one frame period the light quenching period (Fig. 5: DATA ERASE PERIOD) for quenching OLEDs (organic light emitting diodes) by feeding picture image signals to a plurality of data lines, or to establish in one frame period the light quenching period in which picture image signals used for quenching OLEDs are fed to the plurality of data lines.

By this measure, Applicant's present invention achieves extraordinary advantages that when the OLEDs are driven in active matrixes, a blurred edge at the time of a motion picture image display is prevented and the picture image quality is enhanced.

KANEKO, et al., 10/821,847
04 June 2008 Amendment
Responsive to 04 February 2008 Office Action

503.39918VX1 / P5676-1/SK
Page 13

The task of preventing the blurred edge at the time of a motion picture image display is one encountered when performing a hold display while driving the OLEDs in active matrixes.

On the other hand, Harada et al. relates to inorganic LED elements, and the tasks above according to Applicant's present invention are nowhere discussed.

In the Office Action, although the Examiner indicates "Refresh RF period" in Figs. 2 and 3 of Harada et al. corresponds to the "light quenching period" of Applicant's present invention, as seen from the bottom waveform in Harada et al.'s Fig. 3, Harada et al.'s inorganic LED element is not quenched in the period as will apparent from the two brightness peaks therein.

Claims 3-7 v. Sekiya et al.

Important features of Applicant's present invention are, again, those as explained above.

The Examiner indicates that the EXTINCTION PERIOD in STOPPING CONTROL LINE (Z) as shown in Fig. 1 5 of Sekiya et al. corresponds to the light quenching period according to Applicant's present invention.

As will be seen from Fig. 5 of Applicant's present application, in Applicant's present invention, the period required for scanning one picture image is shortened to 1/4 of the one frame period Tf and the 3/4 thereof is assigned to the light quenching period (see especially added dependent claims). Namely, by shortening the scanning period in the gate lines (scanning lines) and assigning the remaining frame period portion to the light quenching period, Applicant's present invention achieves extraordinary advantages that when the OLEDs are driven in active matrixes, a

KANEKO, et al., 10/821,847
04 June 2008 Amendment
Responsive to 04 February 2008 Office Action

503.39918VX1 / P5676-1/SK
Page 14

blurred edge at the time of a motion picture image display is prevented and the picture image quality is enhanced.

On the other hand, as explained above, Sekiya et al. establishes the **EXTINCTION PERIOD** through the newly introduced **STOPPING CONTROL LINE (Z)** other than the gate lines driven in active matrixes of the present invention, therefore, as seen from Figs. 1, 2 and 4 of Sekiya et al., Sekiya et al. will cause a problem of increasing circuit scale such as for drivers.

To conclude, Applicant's present invention achieves extraordinary advantages that when the OLEDs are driven in active matrixes, a blurred edge at the time of a motion picture image display is prevented, and the picture image quality is enhanced without increasing the circuit scale thereof, and it is thought unobvious to replace simply the **STOPPING CONTROL LINE (Z)** of Sekiya et al. to the gate lines of the present invention.

Given that the Harada et al. and Sekiya et al. references are deficient as noted above, it is respectfully submitted that such references (taken individually, or in combination) would not have disclosed or suggested Applicant's claimed invention.

As a result of all of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the applied art would not support a '102 anticipatory-type rejection or '103 obviousness-type rejection of Applicant's claims. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of such '102 and '103 rejections, and express written allowance of all of the rejected claims, are respectfully requested.

KANEKO, et al., 10/821,847
04 June 2008 Amendment
Responsive to 04 February 2008 Office Action

503.39918VX1 / P5676-1/SK
Page 15

EXAMINER INVITED TO TELEPHONE

The Examiner is herein invited to telephone the undersigned attorneys at the local Washington, D.C. area telephone number of 703/312-6600 for discussing any Examiner's Amendments or other suggested actions for accelerating prosecution and moving the present application to allowance.

RESERVATION OF RIGHTS

It is respectfully submitted that any and all claim amendments and/or cancellations submitted within this paper and throughout prosecution of the present application are without prejudice or disclaimer. That is, any above statements, or any present amendment or cancellation of claims (all made without prejudice or disclaimer), should not be taken as an indication or admission that any objection/rejection was valid, or as a disclaimer of any scope or subject matter. Applicant respectfully reserves all rights to file subsequent related application(s) (including reissue applications) directed to any/all previously claimed limitations/features which have been subsequently amended or cancelled, or to any/all limitations/features not yet claimed, i.e., Applicant continues (indefinitely) to maintain no intention or desire to dedicate or surrender any limitations/features of subject matter of the present application to the public.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims listed above as presently being under consideration in the application are now in condition for allowance.

KANEKO, et al., 10/821,847
04 June 2008 Amendment
Responsive to 04 February 2008 Office Action

503.39918VX1 / P5676-1/SK
Page 16

To the extent necessary, Applicant petitions for an extension of time under 37 CFR '1.136. Authorization is herein given to charge any shortage in the fees, including extension of time fees and excess claim fees, to Deposit Account No. 01-2135 (Case No. 500.39918VX1) and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Based upon all of the foregoing, allowance of all presently-pending claims is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

ANTONELLI, TERRY, STOUT & KRAUS, LLP
Paul J. Skwierawski
/Paul J. Skwierawski/
Paul J. Skwierawski
Registration No. 32,173

PJS/slk
(703) 312-6600